

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 13, 2006 has been received and considered. Claims 1-44 have been rejected. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-14, 17-18, 21-23, and 30-35, 37-38, and 40-44

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-14, 17-18, 21-23, and 30-35, 37-38, and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. (US 5,475,853). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed with amendment.

Claim 1 recites processor circuitry for executing one or more instructions that specify a size of data elements in the memory separate and independent from specifying the size of data elements in the at least one general purpose register. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner indicates that this claim 1 limitation is disclosed by Yoshida at column 9, lines 28-36. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

It is respectfully noted that Yoshida as relied upon by the Examiner discloses a destination register (the general purpose register) having a predetermined data element size that is fixed at 32-bits. As such, Yoshida does not disclose specifying a size of data elements in a general purpose register as recited in claim 1, but instead relies upon a predetermined data element size that is fixed. Therefore, Yoshida necessarily does not anticipate each and every element of claim 1 as recited. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection under section 102 of independent claim 1, based upon Yoshida, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-14, 17-18, and 21-23, which are rejected under section 102 based upon Yoshida, are also not anticipated by Yoshida by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. In addition, these claims disclose additional non-obvious limitations. For example, claim 2 recites that the one or more instructions comprising independent fields for separately storing a first data size specifier for the memory and a second data size specifier for the at least one general purpose register. As previously argued, since the at least one general purpose register of Yoshida is of a predetermined and fixed size, there is necessarily no disclosure by Yoshida that a second data size specifier is stored at an independent field as recited. Claim 3 recites that the one or more instructions specify a storage location for defining a first data size specifier for the memory and a second data size specifier for the at least one general purpose register. As previously discussed,

since the general purpose register size is predetermined and fixed, there is necessarily no need to specify a storage location for defining the second data size specifier as recited. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-14, 17-18, and 21-23 is respectfully requested.

Claim 30 recites executing one or more instructions that specify a size of data elements in the memory separate and independent from specifying size of data elements in a general purpose register. As argued with respect to claim 1, Yoshida does not disclose specifying a size of data elements in a general purpose register as recited in claim 20, but instead relies upon a predetermined fixed data element size. Therefore, Yoshida necessarily does not anticipate each and every element of claim 30 as recited. For at least this reason, the withdrawal of the rejection under section 102 of independent claim 30, based upon Yoshida, is respectfully requested.

Claims 31-35, 37-38, and 40 which are rejected under section 102 based upon Yoshida, are also not anticipated by Yoshida for the same reasoning as claim 30, at least by virtue of the dependency from claim 30. In addition, these claims disclose additional non-obvious limitations. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 31-35, 37-38, and 40 is respectfully requested.

Claim 41 recites a data processing system for executing one or more instructions that specify a size of data elements in the memory separate and independent from specifying size of data elements stored in at least one storage location in the data processing system external to memory. Yoshida does not disclose specifying a size of data elements in a location other than memory as recited in claim 41. Therefore, Yoshida necessarily does not anticipate each and every element of claim 41 as recited. For at least this reason, the withdrawal of the rejection under section 102 of independent claim 41, based upon Yoshida, is respectfully requested.

Claims 42-44, which are rejected under section 102 based upon Yoshida, are also not anticipated by Yoshida at least by virtue of the dependency from claim 41. In addition, these claims disclose additional non-obvious limitations. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 42-44 is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 16, 19, 20, and 25-29

At page 11 of the Office Action, claims 16, 19, 20, and 25-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yoshida et al. in view of Chung et al.(US 6,950,922). Each of these claims depend from claim 1. As previously argued, Yoshida does not disclose an instruction specifying a size of a data element in at least one of the general purpose registers as

recited in claim 1. Similarly, Chung does not disclose instructions having this limitations recited in claim 1. Therefore, at least this reason, the combination of Yoshida and Chung does not disclose or suggest, alone or in combination, the recited elements of claims 16, 19, 20, and 25-29. Therefore withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under §103 is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 15, 24, 36, and 39

At page 14 of the Office Action, claims 15, 24, 36, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yoshida et al. in view of Paver et al.(US 6,950,922). Claims 15 and 24 depend from claim 1, claims 36 and 39 depend from claim 30. As previously argued, claims 1 and 30 do not disclose an instruction specifying the size of data elements as recited in claims 1 and 30. Furthermore, Paver does not disclose instructions as recited in claims 1 and 30. Therefore the combination of Yoshida in view of Paver does not disclose or suggest, alone or in combination, the recited elements of claims 15, 24, 36, and 39 as recited. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under §103 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3079.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Gustav Larson/

J. Gustav Larson, Reg. No. 39,263
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone) (512) 439-7199 (fax)

February 6, 2007

Date